

| | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 10/774,710 | KAUL ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | M. Safavi | 3673 |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) M. Safavi.

(3) _____

(2) Richard Anderson.

(4) Russell Petersen.

Date of Interview: 07 December 2004.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 21.

Identification of prior art discussed: Cardinal, Jr.; Barazone.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



MICHAEL SAFAVI
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 354

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an
Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Anderson had argued that Cardinal, Jr. employs multiple rollers for laying multiple sheets at one time and would therefore, not need a transversely movable carriage. Examiner had remarked that only two trucks of Cardinal, Jr. would be needed to lay down any number of sheets. Mr. Anderson added that employing the teachings of Benson et al. is not a fair modification of Cardinal, Jr. since Benson et al deals with a cloth-spreading machine as opposed to an apparatus employed to lay down sheets of "geosynthetic liners" which Mr. Anderson had argued are considerably heavier. Examiner had stated that a further review of the rejection would be made upon Applicant's submission of arguments in response thereto..